From:	Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov
To:	Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Subject:	Re: A few modifications to the table
Date:	01/11/2007 01:08 PM
Attachments:	cumulative_distribution_20071008.txt

Eric-

Attached is a macro in Excel that creates the fields for the cumulative distribution in a text file- I hope either Margaret or Jim will know how to use it. Either way, I'm working on finishing some code that will generate the graphs as well for the distribution & also mean segments (RM, F&T). Also coded the spatial join in ArcView- need to modify so can do a batch of contaminants at once.

B

----- Original Message -----
From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
Date: Thursday, January 11, 2007 3:00 pm
Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table

> Ben, I don't think I received the pdf.
>
> Eric
>
>
>
>
>   Benjamin.Shorr@n
>
>   oaa.gov
>
>
> To
>   01/11/2007 12:56   Margaret Spence
>
>   PM   <mspence@parametrix.com>
>
>
> cc
>   Jay.Field@noaa.gov, Robert
>
>   Gensemer
>
>   <rgensemer@parametrix.com>,
> Dana
>   Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric
>
>   Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA,
>
>   Jay.Field@noaa.gov,
>
>   Robert.Neely@noaa.gov, Carrie
>
>   Smith
> <csmith@parametrix.com>,
>   Jim Koloszar
>
>   <jkoloszar@parametrix.com>
>
>
> Subject
>   Re: A few modifications to
> the
>   table
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> Thanks guys-
>
> Attached is a pdf with an example (PAH) of the analyses that I've been
> doing for surface sediment. This is for ecorisk so far... I've done
> pieces for most other contaminants and have created some macros for
> thecumulative distribution, graphing and also for the spatial join.
>
> B
>
>
> ----- Original Message -----
> From: Margaret Spence <mspence@parametrix.com>
> Date: Thursday, January 11, 2007 1:39 pm

> Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table
>
> > Hi gang. I'm working at home again today and will be joining in the
> > conference call. I've attached an Excel spreadsheet (and a PDF
> > print-out of it) I worked up yesterday to guide me through the
> > analysisprocess and keep files, etc. organized. It also includes
> > severalquestions I came up with yesterday as I started working
> > through QM.
> > Hopefully, these can get resolved during today's call.
> >
> > If anybody needs to reach me, call my cell phone at (b) (6) .
> >
> > Ben, (b) (6) !
> >
> > Margaret
> >
> > Margaret Spence
> > Phone: 425-458-6369
> > Fax: 425-458-6363
> > mspence@parametrix.com
> >
> > PARAMETRIX
> > Inspired people - Inspired solutions - Making a difference
> >
> > >>> <Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov> 01/10/07 10:31 PM >>>
> > Sounds good-
> >
> > I am trying to use the spreadsheet as a guide- added a couple of
> > fieldsfor Cumulative Distr. charts, summary by areas graphs & maps
> > and am
> > checking them off as I go...
> >
(b) (6) rl t
Perhaps tomorrow after the call and discussion of progress we
> > can see
> > if I need to spread some pieces that I am responsible for to
> Margaret,> Jim or Carrie to ensure that they get enough attention.
> >
> > Thanks,
> > Ben
> >
> > ----- Original Message -----
> > From: Robert Gensemer <rgensemer@parametrix.com>
> > Date: Wednesday, January 10, 2007 6:14 pm
> > Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table
> >
> > > I think we need to be as consistent with QM as possible in
> terms of
> > > numbers and units. Lets not get too concerned about cleaning up
> > every> aspect of the risk parameters table to be a perfect match
> > with QM,
> > > though. Remember this is a guide of analyses to do and a
> > > compliation of
> > > screening values, not necessarily a formal spreadsheet work
> template> > (unless you guys have decided to do so??). Thanks to all,
> > > -Bob
> > >
> > > **
> > > Robert W. Gensemer, Ph.D.
> > > Parametrix, Inc.
> > > 33972 Texas Street SW
> > > Albany, OR 97321
> > > T 541-791-1667, x-6510
> > > F 541-791-1699
> > > C 541-760-1511
> > > rgensemer@parametrix.com
> > > **
> > >
> > > >>> <Benjamin.Shorr@noaa.gov> 1/10/2007 7:36:38 AM >>>
> > >
> > > Eric-
> > >
> > > A few notes on the surface sediment screening numbers for
> ecological> > risk:
> > >
> > > I strongly recommend that the units that are in this
> spreadsheet be
> > > changed to reflect the units in Query Manager. There should be a
> > > column
> > > with the units for each analyte (most metals in PPM, vols/svols
> etc> > PPB), and the guidelines should be adjusted to that for
> consistency.> >
> > > Total PCB's TEC should probably be .0598 (off by 10^3)
> > >
> > > Dieldrin (PPB) numbers are TEC/PEC = 1.9/61.8; spreadsheet has
> > > 2.85/6.7
> > >
> > > 2378 TCDD- there is one sample over 9 ng/kg (9E^-6 mg/kg) at 111
> > under> railroad bridge. Looking directly at TCDD2378 conc. may
> > benefit from
> > > a
> > > paired number.
> > >
> > > Hexachlorocyclohexane differs from QM TEC/PEC which is 2.37/4.99
> > PPB,> spreadsheet has .94/1.38
> > >
> > > Hexachlorobutadiene, Tetrachloroethene, Trichloroethene units
> may be
> > > incorrect in spreadsheet (off by 10^3)
> > >

> > > Please let me know if there is a call today that I can join-
> > otherwise> I'm available for the 1pm call tomorrow.
> > > Thanks,
> > > Ben
> > >
> > > ----- Original Message -----
> > > From: Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov
> > > Date: Tuesday, January 9, 2007 3:05 pm
> > > Subject: Re: A few modifications to the table
> > >
> > > > Dana, here is a response to your questions and modifications to
> > the> > table. I am copying the data evaluation folks and attaching
> > your> > modifications to the table. I also have a few questions
> > for Ben
> > > > regarding how QM handles certain summed values.
> > > > >
> > > > > I do not want to look at aluminum. 7600 mg/kg while screening
> > in
> > > > > at a
> > > > > HQ of 0.1 is probably below background - upstream aluminum
> > > > > concentrations range from 12,000 - 33,000 mg/kg. Further, the
> > > direct
> > > > > contact exposure scenarios are very conservative (350 days a
> > year
> > > > > for a
> > > > > beach?).
> > > > >
> > > > > Regarding the TEQs and DDT, DDE and DDD sums - by manually, I
> > > meant
> > > > > thatit was not being calculated automatically by Query Manager.
> > >
> > > We
> > > > shouldbe able to do this in excel. I certainly support looking
> > > at
> > > > > the TEQs
> > > > > but I want to get started on some easier evaluations first. We
> > > may
> > > > > haveto prioritize things here.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ben: What is included in the reported TEQ value - dioxin TEQs
> > or
> > > > > dioxinand dioxin-like PCB TEQ?
> > > > >
> > > > > I don't really know how to best evaluate the PAHs.   Regarding
> > > > > naphthalene and Benzo(a)pyrene, we can look at these as
> individual> > > chemicals. Hopefully,if we look at total PAHs,
> total low
> > molecular> > weight PAHs and BAP and naphthalene, we will get a
> > sense of the PAH
> > > > distribution to help us focus our evaluation. Another thing we
> > > might
> > > > > want to do is query the carcinogenic PAHs and look at total
> > > > > carcinogenicPAHs screened against BAP screening numbers.
> > > > >
> > > > > Ben: Do you know high molecular weight and low molecular weight
> > > PAHs
> > > > > are calculated.
> > > > >
> > > > > Regarding the modified table. I am ok with screening non-
> > > > > carcinogens at
> > > > > 0.1 (with the exception of Aluminum). Because QM is good at
> > > > > looking at
> > > > > concentration ranges, we should look at both HQ = 1 and HQ =
> 0.1.> > >
> > > > > I noticed the error regarding the residential soil PRG for BAP
> > > (units
> > > > > problem). You have correctly modified the screening number to
> > be
> > > > > 0.062mg/kg.
> > > > >
> > > > > Lets figure out the best way to too look at total PCBs (total
> > > aroclors
> > > > > or total congeners). For surface water, we should look at total
> > > > > congeners due to interferences associated with the aroclor
> > > results.
> > > > > For
> > > > > sediment, we should look at both total congeners and total
> > arocIors.> > The total congeners represents a better number.
> > However, we have
> > > much
> > > > > less congener data than aroclor data.   (PMX and Ben, I am
> > > > > attaching a
> > > > > write up on summing).
> > > > >
> > > > > Regarding TBT in Fish, our TBT data is limited to clams, and
> > > juvenile
> > > > > Chinook. Only one sample (a clam sample from the shipyard)
> > > exceeds
> > > > > thefish screening value (detected concentration = 530 ug/kg;
> > fish
> > > > > screeningnumber = 144 ug/kg; shellfish screening number = 1170
> > > > > ug/kg). We can
> > > > > still look at TBT in surface water.
> > > > >
> > > > > Eric
> > > > >
> > > > > (See attached file: 20070108Davoli Modif to ERIC
> > > > > RiskParameters.xls)(Seeattached file: 20060201 Kissinger
> > Approach
> > > > > Portland Harbor Upstream Fish
> > > > > Tissue Sample Total PCBs, PCB TEQs, Dioxin_Furan TEQs.doc)

danadavoli

<danadavoli@avva

nta.com>

To

Eric

Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

01/08/2007 09:44

cc

PM

Dana

Davoli/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

Subject

A few modifications to the

table

I just checked the HH table. Changes are in yellow.

The major changes are HQ=1.0 to HQ=0.1 for the direct contact. I added AL back in for the beaches because it screens in at HQ = 0.1. I don't have the LWG website so I couldn't check if AL screens in for the in-water sediments.

I think we only have Aroclors for the beaches, not congeners. I startedto add all of the TEQs that I would like to see (d/f, PCB, and the sum of these) to the lists but decided to wait until we talk. I don't thinkit would be that hard for Parametrix to do the calculations in EXCEL or ACCESS and import them into the NOAA database. Same for total PCBs fromcongeners and the DDEs, DDDs, and DDTs.None of this should be done manually.

For PAH, I do not know how the NOAA database defines hi MW versus low MW PAHs so I can't tell how close the hi MW would be to the carcinogenic PAHs (B(a)P equivalents.)

Wasn't sure what you meant by using naphthalene and B(a)P as surrogates.For example, do you mean using he naphthalene tox values as surrogates

> > > > for total low MW PAHs?
> > > >
> > > >
> > > > I wasn't sure if TBT is above the SLV in fish. We can use the
> > CRITFC> > Report value of 500 ug/mg as an SLV for all biota for
> > lead but I
> > > don't
> > > > know if we exceed this. For Hg in water, let's ues the ODEQ
> > TMDL
> > > > value.Ican look it up tomorrow.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > > I am in Health and Safety training on Tuesday but will try to
> call> > you
> > > > at the morning break to discuss the table.
> > > > >
> > > > >
> > > >
> > >
> > >
> >
>
>
>